

INTERVIEW SUMMARY/STATEMENT OF ELIZABETH O'BRIEN

Location	MDPH Lab, Jamaica Plain
Date and Time	12/21/11; 10:00 am
Interviewer	Steven Chilian, Deputy General Counsel
Union Representation	Paul Donahue

The witness, Elizabeth O'Brien (EO) supervises the Lab's evidence officers. She was contacted on June 16, 2011 by Shirley Sprague (SS), one of the Lab's evidence officers. According to EO, SS couldn't understand why, as she was entering test results from a number of drug control cards, the name of the primary chemist identified on the cards, Annie Dookhan (AD) was not in the computer as having been assigned the samples for testing. SS told EO that she had to manually enter AD's name which should not have been necessary if the samples had been properly assigned. According to the witness, SS felt this very "weird", enough so, to call her.

After speaking with SS, EO checked for herself. She noted that none of the samples identified by SS had documentation showing that they had been transferred from the evidence office to a chemist for testing. According to EO, when an Evidence Officer receives a sample for testing, the sample is given a unique sequenced number called a control number that allows it to be tracked through the testing process. When a sample is assigned to a Lab chemist, the control number (via a bar code) is scanned into the Lab's computer tracking software and the name of the chemist who has been assigned to test the sample is automatically entered into the computer.

According to EO, she then checked the evidence office log book (log book) and noted that none of the samples showed documentation that they had been transferred by an evidence officer to the Lab for testing. There were no entries in the log book connected with these samples. She then proceeded to check the Lab's computer. The computer program showed that the samples were still in the evidence safe/office and not yet assigned.

EO stated that she did not make a copy of the log book on June 16, but did contact Charles Salemi (CS), AD's Supervisor, about her discovery on June 17. The witness and CS together, went through the same process as the witness had done on her own before, including an examination of the log book. CS confirmed her findings. EO e-mailed Julie Nassif (JN) that day seeking a meeting to discuss the matter.


According to EO, she met CS and JN on June 20. The meeting lasted approximately one hour. EO brought the log book to this meeting. The log book, as before, contained no entries for the samples in question. At the conclusion of the meeting, they all agreed that they needed to talk to AD.

On June 21, 2011, EO, CS, and JN met with AD. Prior to this meeting, EO went back to get the log book to bring to the meeting. When she examined the log book this time, she noted that the log book entries for the relevant samples now showed them as having been transferred to AD by Gloria Philips (GP) on June 14, 2011.

At the meeting, AD was confronted with this information. AD was shown the log book entries and told that they had been witnessed to be blank on the 16th. AD was also told how they were made aware of the issue by SS. Finally, AD was told that GP's last work day was on 6/14 and that she could not have written those entries. According to EO, JN stated to AD that, "from where I stand it looks like you did it." AD's response was stated to be, "I can understand why you would think that." AD did not admit to writing the entries, but could not provide an explanation. According to EO, there was no discussion about what would happen to AD at this meeting.

I, Elizabeth O'Brien have been provided an opportunity to review the above interview summary prepared by Steven Chilian and to make any changes. I hereby adopt this summary as my own and declare that that the information contained therein is a true and accurate.

Signed under the penalties of perjury this 8th day of, February 2012.


Elizabeth O'Brien